

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-14 and 16-26 are pending in the present application. Claim 15 is cancelled, and claims 1, 3-7, 10, 16, and 20-22 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claims 16-20, 22, and 23 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As a result, claim 16 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim 15, and therefore, claim 16 is allowable. Claim 20 has been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim 15, and therefore, claim 20 is also allowable. Claims 17-19 depend from and further limit claim 16, and therefore, claims 17-19 are also allowable. Claim 22 has been amended to include all of the limitations of the base claim 21, and therefore, claim 22 is allowable. Claim 23 depends from and further limits claim 22, and therefore, claim 23 is also allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 16-20, 22, and 23 be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the drawings because they assertedly include reference numeral 515 in Figure 5 and reference numerals 615 and 625 in Figure 6 that are not mentioned in the description. As a result, Applicants have amended paragraph [0042] to include a reference to reference numeral 515 in Figure 5 and paragraph [0047] to include a reference to reference numerals 615 and 625 in Figure 6. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to the specification as assertedly omitting the serial numbers of related applications. In response, Applicants have amended paragraph [0002] to include the serial numbers. Applicants note that the filing date of U.S. Patent Application Ser. No.

10/659,905 was incorrect due to an inadvertent error and has been corrected herein by amendment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action objected to claims 3-5 and 7 as assertedly containing miscellaneous informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 3-5 and 7, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn. Regarding claims 3 and 5, the phrase “ $t_m, t_{m-1}, t_{m-2}, \dots, t_1, t_0$ ” refers to a sequence of bits representing the time transmitted by a source. Paragraph [0059] has also been amended to include commas.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as assertedly lacking patentable utility. Without commenting on or agreeing with this assertion, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite “A method for processing a received sequence comprising.” The claim recites receiving a hypothesis, determining a start and stop condition, selecting samples from the received sequence based on the start condition, and providing the samples and the hypothesis, which are aligned on a symbol boundary, to a correlator. This process describes how the received sequence is processed and provides a patentable utility. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn. Claims 2-10 depend from and further limit claim 1, and therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of claims 2-10 be withdrawn as well.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8-11 and 13-15 were rejected as assertedly being anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) by U.S. Patent No. 6,304,216 (“Gronemeyer”). Claim 12 was rejected as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Gronemeyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,130,331 (“Kang”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite that “the start condition aligns the samples and the hypothesis on a symbol boundary.” The cited references fail to teach or suggest this

limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn. Claims 2, 6, and 8-14 depend from and further limit claim 1, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Claims 21 and 24-26 were rejected as assertedly being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) by Gronemeyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,532,982 (“White”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants have amended claim 21 to recite that “wherein the tests are performed such that each hypothesis is aligned along symbol boundaries.” The cited references fail to teach or suggest this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 21 be withdrawn. Claims 24-26 depend from and further limit claim 21, and accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn as well.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ron Neerings, Applicants' attorney, at 972-917-5299 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. In the event that the enclosed fees are insufficient, please charge any additional fees required to keep this application pending, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

July 2, 2007  
Date

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.  
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
Tel.: 972-732-1001  
Fax: 972-732-9218

/Roger C. Knapp/  
Roger C. Knapp  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 46,836